

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig.1. In Figure 1, previously omitted element 34 has been added showing "a plurality of shelves as claimed in Claim 19." No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims pending in this application are Claims 1-19. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to correct for the informalities objections. Amendment to Fig. 1 drawing was made to correct drawing objections. Allowable Claims 10 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice and have been rewritten into independent form to address both 102(b) and 103(a) rejections. Accordingly, upon entry of these amendments, Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-19 and newly amended drawings will be before the Examiner for consideration.

Claim Objections

1. The Examiner had objected to Claims 1 and 14 for confusing use of language of the terms "the" or "said," and suggested that Applicant uses the term "said" in front of "at least three walls" in Claim 1 and "first means" in Claim 14. Applicant has amended both Claims to include the term "said" in both "at least three walls" and in front of "first means" as suggested by Examiner.

In light of newly amended Claim 1 and 14, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw the objection as stated above.

Drawing Objections

2. The Examiner had objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention as specified in Claim 19.

Applicant has amended Figure 1 to include the limitation of Claim 19, which includes "a plurality of shelves coupled to said outer section of said walls to accommodate a keyboard for the CPU or other related items." In amended Figure 1, previously omitted element 34 has been added. Applicant believes that no new matter has been added in the amendment of Figure 1. Replacement and annotated sheets of Figure 1 are attached to this response.

In light of newly amended Figure 1, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw the objection as stated above.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 103(a) Rejections

3. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by LaFleur (US 6,289,326). Examiner states that LaFleur

teaches Applicant's foldable stand. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Examiner admits later in the office action that LaFleur does not teach or suggest the limitations of Claims 10, 13 and 17, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims. As a result, Applicant has rewritten Claim 1 to include limitation of allowable Claims 10 and 13 to overcome the 102(b) rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 10 and 13. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 10 having "at least one handle coupled to said outer section of said wall(s) of said stand for portability" and Claim 13 having "said outer section of said walls include a hook and loop material for attaching objects to said stand." Applicant cancels Claims 10 and 13 without prejudice. Since LaFleur does not teach nor suggest the elements of the handle and hook and loop material, nor at least one handle coupled to said outer section of said wall(s) of said stand for portability, and in light of newly amended Claim 1 incorporating such limitations, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claim 1 and withdraw the 102(b) rejection. Furthermore, since dependent Claims 2-9, 11-12, 14-16, and 18 also include the newly incorporated limitations of independent Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Claims 2-9, 11-12, 14-16, and 18 and that the 102(b) rejection be withdrawn.

4. The Examiner has rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over LaFleur. Examiner states that LaFleur discloses the claimed invention with only one shelf coupled to the outer section of said wall, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add one more shelf to the device of LaFleur, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Again, the Examiner admits later in the office action that LaFleur does not teach or suggest the limitations of Claims 10, 13 and 17, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims. For the same reasons in Applicants' response for the 102(b) rejection, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of Claims 10 and 13. Since rejected Claim 19 now

dependents from newly amended Claim 1 incorporating the limitation of 2 allowable Claims 10 and 13, Applicant believes that Claim 19 should now be patentable over LaFleur. Examiner admits that LaFleur does not teach or suggest a stand having "a hook and loop material for attaching objects to the stand nor at least one handle coupled to said outer section of said wall(s) of said stand for portability." For these reasons, Applicant believes that Claim 19 should now not be unpatentable over LaFleur, and respectfully requests reconsideration of Claim 19 in light of newly amended Claim 1 and that the 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

Since Applicant has chosen to amend the Claims to put the application in condition for allowance for reasons given in the parent patent, a request to withdraw the grounds for the 102(b) and 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-19 and newly amended Fig. 1 are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees associated with filing of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0931.

Applicant submits that all grounds for rejection of claims presented herein have been addressed and amended as such. Accordingly, Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-19 and newly amended drawings will be before the Examiner for prosecution on the merits.

Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any aspect of this response, or if the examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully Submitted,



CHARLENE A. HALEY

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 52,983

Navy Case No. 83253

NAWCWD

Office of Counsel, Code K00000D
1 Administration Circle, STOP 1009
China Lake, CA 93555-6100
Telephone: (760) 939-4177
Facsimile: (760) 939-0679

Appl. No. 10/687,946
Amdt. Dated Oct. 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2005
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes




FIGURE 1